

Mr. Speaker, this is an obtuse and dangerous way to approach the greatest threat to global security, and Congress must not allow any deal with Iran to leave in place the possibility that the regime can obtain a nuclear weapon.

AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the American people keep asking: Where have all the good jobs gone? And I truly appreciate my colleagues, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York and Congressman PAUL TONKO of New York, for joining me tonight.

We are talking about jobs that can create a middle-class way of life for the people who occupy them as well as local businesses, jobs that produce living wages, that produce good health benefits and pensions and 401(k)s you can depend upon.

□ 1645

Now, since the 1980s, unlike any period following World War II, because the United States is importing more than we are exporting, we actually have lost millions and millions of jobs.

People complain about a budget deficit. The reason we have a budget deficit is because we have a trade deficit. In fact, since the mid-1970s, every single trade agreement the United States has signed of any consequence has resulted in more and more and more red ink.

Go to any store in this country. I don't care if you are trying to buy a suit or an automobile or curtains, I really don't care what it is, if you can find something made in America, that is a discovery.

What does that mean? It means that rather than exporting more than we import, we have been driving down the living standard of most Americans decade after decade. Jobs here disappear while capital moves abroad and exploits penny wage workers who have no hope for a better life because they live in places that have no Democratic values.

It is a shocking number to put on the record, but since the mid-1990s, this country has amassed over \$4.3 trillion in trade deficit—and that is a conservative estimate—amounting to a job loss of over 8.5 million good jobs. That is what this red ink is all about. It is a shocking figure. The American people, they sort of know it innately, but when you really put it up there they go, "Yeah." That is what happened.

If you look here, this shows that, with more imports, you get fewer jobs. When the trade deficit keeps getting worse, if you are out of a job yet, keep buying foreign. I am not against trade,

I am for balanced trade, but I am not for trade that puts our country in this kind of an economic hole.

This is just one example—and we will go back to it a little bit later—this is the most recent agreement that the United States signed called the Korea Free Trade Agreement. We were supposed to be able to sell 50,000 cars in Korea.

Guess what. We have been able to ship—here is our piddly little shipment over there—750,000 cars. Guess how many they have sent over here. Look at this arrow compared to that little tiddlywink there. Imported vehicles from Korea, over 561,000 compared to 7,450.

So when you start wondering where your job has gone, think about what has happened to these trade agreements and how they have put us deeper and deeper in the trade hole and then in the budget deficit hole.

When I ask individual Americans how their life is going under the corporate globalization model that has been accelerated by the so-called free trade agreements, if they answer honestly and if they are not a multimillionaire investor, consistently, the response is one of great disappointment and too frequently one of great distress. The middle class in America is in trouble.

It is safe to say that this is a direct result of the long list of free trade deals that have benefited only the wealthiest in the global environment in which we live, wealthy investors who can survive anywhere. In fact, they have a lot of houses—Paris, Geneva, you name it—but each of us has a house that is our most important asset.

We come from little communities across this country, and we have a right to a good life. Our people have a right to a good life because they work so hard. Trade policy is the major reason, in my opinion, that America cannot employ all Americans seeking work.

I wanted to allow my colleagues to also speak this evening. Let me just give you a couple examples, practical examples—actually, the list could go all across this floor if I were to roll it out. Fort Smith, Arkansas, ask the 1,860 workers who lost jobs at Whirlpool when production was shifted to Mexico.

How about the 300 people who worked at the Vise-Grip plant in DeWitt, Nebraska, a town of only 572 residents, who all lost their jobs, and some would say their town identity, when the company moved to China to keep the name competitive.

How about Maytag from Newton, Iowa—one of America's iconic products—shut down, moved to Monterrey, Mexico. If you look at the census statistics from the time that happened over a decade and a half ago until today, poverty in Newton has risen up to a level of 25 percent.

This is happening across this country.

How about the 535 workers who made hearing aids in Eden Prairie, Min-

nesota, who were laid off when the Starkey Laboratories factory moved to Mexico and China.

Every American listening knows a company or more that has done exactly the same thing. If you go down to those countries and you see how the people live, you couldn't stomach it; you simply couldn't. I have gone down to the maquiladoras in Mexico.

I have asked the workers in those factories, "Take me to where you live," and they do. It is truly sad to see a tiny little crate barrel house powered by a lightbulb connected to a battery, and this is what development brings them. Come now. Come now. The world can do better than that.

13,000 citizens of our congressional district in Ohio had jobs shifted overseas, outsourced to someplace else. Oh, they know this tale all too well.

I would ask my dear colleague from New York—New York has been battered, just like Ohio has been battered—Congressman PAUL TONKO, one of the greatest leaders on economic growth for our country, who has taken time tonight during a very busy week to join us here, thank you so very much for coming to the floor tonight.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative KAPTUR. Thank you for leading us in this discussion. We are going to be joined in a minute with our representative from Rochester, New York, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, and she and I, we can suggest, live along the Erie Canal Corridor, she at the western end of upstate New York, I at the eastern end.

That corridor became the birthplace of a necklace of communities dubbed "mill towns" with the development of the Erie Canal. Product activity, product discovery, product development was the theme ongoing in that region. People tethered their American dream in these mill towns. They came, they worked their fingers to the bone, they came up with product ideas, and that was the pulse of our community. Manufacturing was alive and well.

Then we saw this onslaught of what was called a trade negotiations process, where we would get into this concept of providing for negotiations, but those negotiations have grown a far distance from trade barriers and negotiations on tariffs. It became a way to encourage public policy in a very veiled kind of concept, so that you were addressing far beyond the tariff measures and the trade burdens.

What we have today, as you indicated, is trillions of dollars in trade deficit where these manufacturing jobs have left our home communities in upstate New York and are now, in many situations, in underdeveloped nations or newly developing nations.

When we look at the Trans-Pacific Partnership that is looming as one of the largest, if not the largest, most complex trade negotiation ever, you are going to look at situations where you have a minimum wage of 25 cents, for instance, in Vietnam, or an average hourly salary of 75 cents.

This is not what we want to bring as a condition for our American workers. We can't compete with that, nor should we. We are holding down the workers' rights, the human rights, of these people in developing nations by agreeing to these sorts of agreements.

I think that we can do better. We must do better. I stand for fair trade. This free trade concept where we sacrifice American workers, we find the rusting of manufacturing towns as a result, is not what the doctor ordered for the American economy.

We need to be fair to the middle class. This is the great many of us who have found our American prosperity developed in manufacturing centers where we were able to raise a family and grow a community and develop a neighborhood simply by a just salary, sound benefits, and the security of knowing that your job was your grounding in that community.

Free trade has taken away that American Dream for far too many, and we need to do better. We cannot continue to endure these trade deficits that are of the trillions of dollars and watch the many, many millions of jobs lost in the ensuing efforts because it is an unsustainable outcome.

I have watched as so many manufacturing centers left our area. I represent the Mohawk Valley Capital District region of New York. We witnessed a huge exodus of jobs. I have people telling me today, as they are closing down factories, they cannot compete with situations in China, for instance, where there are many conditions that favor those businesses because of these sound partnerships that they have with their government, where they will buy the factory and, perhaps, pay the utility bill and then further manipulate the currency.

There is a lot of work to be done on these issues. We need to make certain we go forward and have a sound overview by Congress, so that there is an investment by Congress and we are not circumventing our responsibilities and going forth with sound policy that will strengthen the great many of us called the "middle class of America," provide for the American dream to be tethered in these mill towns, where we have manufacturing opportunities that are paying sound salaries, providing great benefits, and not destroying workers' rights.

I thank you for leading us in this discussion and look forward to exchanging many thoughts here in the ensuing hour.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, thank you so much for coming to the floor this evening.

I grew up in a family where the work ethic was really respected, and we believed in it because you could get somewhere. You worked long hours. Sometimes, you worked 7 days a week, but you could save a little bit of money.

Now, you try to save money and the banks pay you .07 percent interest or

something like that, so if you are a saver, if you have a good work ethic, if you have a good savings ethic, what does the market yield you really?

What I worry about is the work ethic itself because I talk to many employers now and they say, "MARCY, do you know what, if we have to hire 40 people," let's say, for part-time jobs in a retail store, they say, "you can't believe how many people we have to go through until we find people who really want to work."

Well, one of the things that is happening across this country is large numbers of people don't believe working counts because they have seen what has happened in their own families. We stand to lose the work ethic itself among major segments of this population. That is very worrisome to me, and we see related social problems and rising poverty.

I mentioned in the Maytag situation in Newton, Iowa—and I am not just picking on Newton, Iowa—but there was a community that absolutely lived for that company. It was invented there.

Fred Maytag is buried right there, looking over his town and parks he endowed and all the people whose lives he helped to elevate. To see poverty increase 25 percent of the total community tells you where we are headed. That is just one place, but it is all across our country.

Before I call on Congresswoman SLAUGHTER to add her eloquent words this evening, I wanted to mention Norma McFadden, who worked in my district, one of 150 employees who made crayons for a company called Dixon Ticonderoga, one of Ohio's oldest manufacturers dating back to 1835, before the factory was closed and offshored to Mexico in 2002.

Norma, along with many of her colleagues, took advantage of what was then called "trade adjustment assistance," which since has been eliminated, and she got an alternative degree as a phlebotomist.

Many of the jobs of her fellow coworkers—there were no jobs for them to go to. That poor factory in Sandusky, Ohio, just shuttered. The property hasn't been reused. These were people who made a good product, they worked for years, they were proud of their community, they were proud of their company, and all of a sudden, it was all jerked away. I can guarantee you that the people who are working those jobs outside of Mexico City do not earn a living wage.

What are we doing? What are we doing to this country and what hope do we provide to the people of other countries that their work matters? I say what we are yielding is social instability, instability.

If you look at the murders around this country and what is happening with the drug epidemic in this country, don't think there isn't a connection between hopelessness and what is happening, not to some of the wealthy peo-

ple that prowl around the Capitol who have the ability to pay to get here or who have lobbying firms here or somehow want to reach a Member of Congress on some very arcane amendment that they wanted.

I am talking about the average person who will never come to Washington, who has a belief in this country, but it is starting to erode at the edges because their economic future is so uncertain.

□ 1700

I want to call on a real fighter for the American people, who has been a stalwart protagonist of enormous dimension here for jobs in America and for the fair treatment of workers everywhere, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER, the ranking member of the Rules Committee. She is such a gifted member.

Thank you for being here tonight.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you so much for putting this together. It is so important. I hope that people listening to us will understand that some of us here have been trying for years to try to save American jobs from bad trade policy.

Every time the Congress debates a trade agreement, they make these grand promises. I remember NAFTA. They said 250,000 brand-new jobs were going to be coming to Rochester, New York. None of it ever happened. We were promised this great, bright future that didn't show up.

Frankly, over my career here, which has been nice and prosperous and creative, I have never yet seen a trade policy that came out of this Congress of the United States that benefited in any way the American manufacturer or the American worker.

I come from a district that was devastated by NAFTA, and I want to tell you a story about Eastman Kodak. Kodak, one of the great commercial institutions and innovators of the 20th century, once had over 60,000 jobs in the Rochester area. Now, there are only a few thousand left, and this is the trend all across the country.

Eastman Kodak is a name that everybody knows, with Kodachrome and everything that they have done for motion pictures. A study was done once that showed that the word "Kodak," stated to people that heard it, that it was solid, it was good and dependable—Eastman Kodak, the backbone, basically, of Rochester, New York.

They were great patrons of the art, education, everything that they did. Actually, George Eastman made sure that every soldier that went away to the first World War got a camera. It was in a day that you had to send the camera back to the factory to be opened and developed. All these soldiers sent them back and forth while they were overseas fighting—or even in the country. They had this Eastman Kodak camera going back and forth every month.

It would take me all night here to talk about how this is the company

that built the Norden bombsight that won the Second World War and engineers that have come from this company, which is now devastated. Now, they have started up some smaller companies, for which we have great hope.

In fact, the laser beam that took down the three Somali pilots that were holding Captain Phillips—if you remember, they shot simultaneously off a major rocking boat, a big one. Captain Phillips and the pirates were in a smaller one.

They shot simultaneously and killed the three pirates with a laser beam from Rochester. The night vision goggles that everybody is so concerned about and the Navy SEALs used to take down Osama bin Laden are component parts from Rochester. We have all that ability there, but we took the jobs right out from under them.

This debate comes down to a thing called Fast Track, which isn't going to mean much to anybody, but in the seventies, we were the largest manufacturers in the world, and we were pretty darn sure we would be forever.

We saw no end to that great prosperity because people were innovators, and we saw the wonderful things we were able to do. Generations of families would work at these major companies in all of our districts, and it was solid as a rock, and you knew it was always going to be there, until it wasn't.

Fast Track came up in the seventies when we were the largest manufacturer, and the idea was that since we were so good and we wanted to help rebuild the economies of other countries and that we would allow the President and whoever negotiated the trade to simply bring the agreement, once they were finished with it, to the Congress of the United States, with no committee action whatever. We are not even told what is in those trade agreements. I personally have tried, on behalf of Hickey Freeman, to find that out about textiles and could not.

The idea was we would simply vote up or down, no amendment, no nothing—just a quick vote and go—taking away the whole reason for our existence here to represent the people who sent us here and to do what we could to keep the United States prosperous and forward looking.

When I was chair of the Rules Committee briefly—because it came under the purview of the Rules Committee—we were able to get rid of it. Unfortunately, the Korea Free Trade Agreement was filed before we were able to get rid of it, so Korea was done under Fast Track, and I appreciate so much what you have shown us with that. It was very troubling to me about Korea.

South Korea, as we pointed out, shows 7,450 cars. There are 26 dealers in South Korea that will sell American cars, but during the same period that we sold 78,000, they sold 561,626 here. We obviously wanted South Korea to prosper. We lost so many lives there. We fought very hard for their freedom.

But we also signed a treaty that if anybody attacks South Korea, the United States is obligated to go and fight. Would you think that maybe with all of that—we rebuilt their economy, we saved their country—that they might sell American cars?

What we have seen and what we tried to say on this floor, the three of us all talking about it, is you are buying a pig in a poke here. This is not going to work because the simple reason is we never had enforcement on a single one of our trade bills. We simply reduce our tariff. Everything comes flooding in here.

It is not tariffs that keeps our goods from selling in other countries. It is the unseen trade barriers. They don't like the bumper. The steering wheel is wrong. The window doesn't fit. Or they simply let it sit at ports, on docks, rotting and rusting and whatever, but they don't sell, and we have not a single thing to do about it.

I have a bill that I am going to reintroduce in January—I am hoping we can get a lot more attention on it—which is a bipartisan bill with a lot of outside support that simply says that trade agreements being negotiated by the United States of America would also be accompanied by an enforcement part, which would be a person in the Labor Department who would do it, not the people who wrote those bills.

The people who write those bills have such pride of authorship. I don't know of a single time—maybe once or twice with the WTO—where we have tried to do something about unfair labor practices, but we don't really worry about that. We just take it—or our people take it—those who have lost all the jobs.

The bill we have says we can also do what we call “snap back,” that Congress can stop that until they do away with the unfair barriers that prevent our goods from being sold in their countries, as the agreement stated they would be.

We are about to do another one, if you can believe it. This one is a hum-dinger. This one goes over 11 countries. Again, we have no idea what is in it, as I told you. They are trying to get it through Fast Track. We have a good start, I think, on stopping that.

I am trying to get the number here. We have, I think, 30 Republicans that have signed on not to do Fast Track. We have about a total of 150 Members of the House who will not and, certainly, the Senate. We have let the President of the United States as well as the trade negotiator know that Fast Track won't work here.

Food safety is a real crucial issue. One of my colleagues, ROSA DELAURO, said that when you read about delta shrimp, you are probably reading about the Mekong Delta shrimp. The food safety issue is so bad, as we understand it in this trade bill, that if we cause them to lose any money when they bring in bad fish—which, in the first place, frankly, is not tested nearly

enough when it comes in—or anything else that causes them to have any economic cost, they can sue us.

Think about this for a minute. They can sue us because we enforced our own clean air standards and our clean water standards and our food safety standards. I will tell you it boggles the mind just simply to think about it.

What we are asking—and we have let the President know and the whole world that we are trying to get to understand—is that this Congress of the United States will not stand by for Fast Track, and to have a bill come up here that will decimate, again, parts of this country in the United States, threaten our food safety laws, and not have the ability to read the thing, have committee action on it, and to amend it, all that would be gone under Fast Track, and we would only be able to vote up or down.

I will tell you we have had such devastating losses from playing the game that way that it would boggle the mind that we would stand by and watch that happen yet again in cases where it would be even worse.

I am so pleased to be here tonight and join with my friends who try to fight the good fight. This is a magnificent country, and all of us certainly have benefitted from it. Just to be able to be a Representative in the Congress of the United States is remarkable, but with that goes a heck of a responsibility.

That responsibility is to leave this place better than we found it. We can't do that with this trade bill, so I urge all my colleagues, everybody listening, to pay attention to what is going on here and help us to get people that represent you to join us in the fight to stop this trade agreement in its tracks.

As everybody else has said—and I think it goes without saying—I have no problems with free trade—well, free trade I have got a lot of troubles with. Let me back that up.

I have no trouble with international trade. It is the wave of the future. We are doing it. Free trade has always meant that people come in here free and eat our lunch. Fair trade is a whole other issue. Let's have a little fair trade for a change. It would do us a world of good.

Thank you very much, Marcy, for letting me be here.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank the gentlelady, as busy as you are, for joining us this evening and fighting for jobs for America's workers from coast to coast. Thank you so very, very much.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. It is a pleasure.

Ms. KAPTUR. We appreciate your contributions this evening.

Following on what Congresswoman SLAUGHTER has stated, I can guarantee you that, according to polls done by the Pew Research Center, which is a national polling organization, over half of Americans say that free trade has been about U.S. job losses. They have experienced it. They know that whether it is NAFTA, whether it is the China

deal, whether it is CAFTA—in Latin America or Korea, CAFTA has operated the reverse.

Enough people have now, sadly, suffered. They have internalized what is going on, and they are wondering what has happened to this country. Not only have they lost their jobs, but because the economy hasn't grown as fast, we are seeing that there is a downward pressure on wages in this country.

I see people being hired in plants in my district now in the auto industry, which is doing better because we refinanced it a couple of years ago, but before, people used to be able to go in there and earn \$20, \$30 an hour.

Now, they are starting them at a little above minimum wage. They are working them 7 days a week, 10 hours a day. They are working two and three times as hard because there is this downward pressure on wages.

I mentioned Norma McFadden having worked at Dixon Ticonderoga in Ohio. I can tell you two out of every five of the displaced manufacturing workers who were actually able to be rehired had wage reductions of more than 20 percent.

Congressman TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I was just going to add to that statement, Representative, that there was a GAO study, a report that was called for by Representative GEORGE MILLER and Representative SANDY LEVIN. That report clearly indicated that the provisions of these trade agreements have not been carefully and well-enough monitored and enforced. Also, violations that were discovered which require investigations were not done expeditiously. There are huge delays.

That ought to raise some concern to Members of Congress who might just casually dismiss this authority that we should have to review these agreements. These agreements, again, are far beyond tariffs and trade barriers.

They include public policy components that would range from worker protection to environmental concerns to food safety to consumer protection. These are all given dynamics that should not first and foremost be part of these agreements, but because they are, can have devastating consequences.

Again, I think this effort here is about greed. It is about providing for those that can control and manipulate that economy at the expense of diminishing the worker. We have seen what has happened here as we have lost American jobs in our manufacturing base.

The people who have been displaced from the manufacturing centers are now working in jobs that are providing for far less dollars—remuneration—for the hard work that they invest into that new job.

We are also watching the developing nations and their workers getting paid with a minimum wage of 25 cents or an average hourly rate of 75 cents. That is really destroying the workers not only this in country, but around the world.

To this Nation and her needs, it is about growing our middle class, growing our economy, protecting our middle class, and when we are sending off jobs in this casual, dismissive type of agreement concept called free trade, it is not a fair outcome, and fair trade is where it ought to be.

We need to go forward. I agree with the comments made by Representative SLAUGHTER. We need to make certain there is not a Fast Track opportunity where we circumvent the responsibilities of Congress, where we should have debate, where we should allow for amendments, and not just move to a single up-or-down vote.

□ 1715

That is dangerous, that is far reducing the involvement of Congress. It is relinquishing Congress of its responsibilities and its duties and the empowerment that it can bring to the American worker.

So there is much work that needs to be done here. And as one who represents many manufacturing towns that in their heyday provided for great jobs and great opportunity and for the tethering of the American Dream, we need to move forward with progressive responses rather than this attack on working families in this country and around the world.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, thank you so very, very much for your comments. And obviously, New York has been battered, as so many other places in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Youngstown, Ohio (Mr. RYAN). He fights every minute of every day for the people of our country, and certainly for the people of his district in northeastern Ohio, a leader here, a rising leader nationally, and we thank him so much for joining us tonight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you.

All these fights are side by side with my friends from Toledo and upstate New York. And you look, upstate New York with Ms. SLAUGHTER, the Great Lakes States, I think we are the ones who have seen over the course of the last two or three decades really what has happened to our manufacturing base. I think both of you have hit the nail on the head.

And you look at the politics and the elections, from 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, in my estimation, these are all about economics. These are about average people not feeling like they have opportunity to latch on to the American Dream.

I think when we talk about these trade agreements, the issue inevitably comes down to manufacturing. How can we reinvigorate manufacturing in the United States again?

And it is not just the trade agreements, but it is what other progressive policies do we have with the Tax Code, with investments and infrastructure, research and development, renewable energy.

You talk about windmills. You have got to make everything that is in that

windmill. The tons of steel, all of the component parts need to be manufactured. So why wouldn't we focus on getting that done here in the United States so we can put our folks back to work in manufacturing jobs that pay more, more secure pensions, more secure and higher benefits? That is, I think, ultimately the ladder up.

I will give you an example where we got this right. We had an opportunity in Youngstown, Ohio, and Girard, Ohio, for an expansion of a new steel mill, up to a billion dollars. And we needed to do some site preparation work, and we were able to get \$20 million from the stimulus package. Then the company said, You need to level the playing field with China.

And so the President put tariffs on the steel tubing coming in from China. And in Youngstown, Ohio, we have a billion dollar steel mill that put our building trades to work for a year and a half to 2 years, over 1,000, 1,500-plus workers to build the facility, 350 new jobs, investments back in the community.

That is when we get it right, when we level the playing field, when we put the tariffs on their dumped products coming into the United States. That, to me, is what this is all about.

You go down the Ohio River, north on the turnpike over to Toledo and Chicago and into the Great Lakes. You go east on 90, and you go through Pennsylvania and into New York. These are the regions of the country that, if we want America to not feel so insecure economically, we have got to get these reinvestments back into these communities.

We can't just give a blank check and ignore what needs to be negotiated. Our opportunity here, our job here, I think, is to lift all of these other countries up and not exploit and then have the bad food come back to the United States or the cheap products come back to the United States, whether we are talking about drywall or baby food or whatever the story is from the last couple of years.

I think we have an opportunity to right the ship. We have got to have a coalition here in Congress that is willing to do that, and we do have an opportunity. Just think about this.

I know my friend from Minnesota wants to speak a little bit as well.

If we had a national manufacturing policy in the United States, if we said we are going to rebuild the United States, how many Members of this Congress, if we said, how much is your combined sewer that you are going to have to invest in the next 10 years? A billion? Some big cities are a billion dollars; hundreds of millions in small-to mid-sized towns like the ones I represent, getting close to actually billions of dollars.

If we put people back to work and made the investment and our building trades all went back to work, union workers, good contracts, good wages,

good benefits, we incentivized manufacturing with the Tax Code and research and all the rest, we invested in the renewable energies so that we can make the solar panels, make the wind-mills and we move in this direction, we could light up the United States again with a few key changes. But I think having a trade policy that Congress has input on, that levels the playing field, does not sacrifice our clean air, our clean water, our food, is the way to go about it.

So I just wanted to stop in, thank my friends, thank the dean of our delegation in Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, for this leadership. We have got to keep pushing back. So I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here with you and look forward to hopefully beating this thing back.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman RYAN, thank you so very much for your time this evening, for your leadership, for the great voice that you give to America's economic future and to all of those who work to make it possible. Thank you for the respect you show them and for the amount of time that you devote to Make It In America and toward manufacturing in America. Thank you so very, very much.

Mr. Speaker, we have marvelous leaders who have joined us tonight from across the country, obviously, from our sister State of Minnesota, a Great Lakes State that has received its fair share of battering over the years, and a great, great Member, KEITH ELLISON, the leader in our Progressive Caucus, as well as, obviously, a leader in the Minnesota delegation.

Thank you so very much for being with us this evening.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I certainly appreciate it. And I want to thank her for taking up this important issue of trade agreements, trade generally and trade promotion authority.

I just want to say that Minnesota has had its experience with trade agreements. According to policy experts, if you look at the North American Free Trade Agreement, which lifted tariffs and other trade barriers between North American countries, it has led to the outsourcing of over 30,000 Minnesota jobs. It also did bring in some jobs; but the net outcome, after you take the lost jobs and the gained jobs together, is a loss of 13,700 jobs.

So the thing is that some people say, well, trade will help. It will help some people. But when you look at everybody, it has not been a job gainer for us, as it was promised to be. And I think that is very important.

I am glad that Congressman RYAN and you and others have been speaking in a local framework. I am glad to hear about New York and Ohio.

I can just tell you from my own State of Minnesota, we are not afraid of trade. We believe we have got the best workers in the world and we can

compete with anybody, but only on the basis of a fair trade. We believe we can compete, we can make great products, but when other countries are dumping, when they are manipulating their currency, when all types of crazy things are happening like that, then we are not talking about fair trade. We are talking about free trade, and free trade is free-for-all trade, and free-for-all is not going to be good.

I can assure you that when the trade deal comes that really does support labor standards and environmental standards in the right way, I won't be standing against it. But until then, I have to stand against it.

I just also want to say that there has been a lot of talk recently because of this Trans-Pacific Partnership, this deal that has been negotiated over the last several months, and there is a lot of concern about it. But before people get really worried about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is the new trade deal, the new NAFTA, I think they ought to worry about something called Fast Track or Trade Promotion Authority, because here is the thing.

Whether you like these trade deals or you don't like them, I doubt that you believe that they are perfect as they come out of the hands of the U.S. Trade Representative and all these other countries. I doubt you believe that they couldn't benefit from any negotiation or any amendment, because around here, we have never seen a perfect piece of legislation. Even the best can be improved. Yet, if we grant Trade Promotion Authority, we will only have an up-or-down vote. We will literally abandon our national sovereignty to other countries who will be able to sue American companies for lost profits.

I don't mind dealing in an American court, but I do have a problem being in an international court just because we want to ban smoking, just because we want better environmental regulation, just because we want to take care of our people. We may then be sued for lost profits by some foreign company.

Of course, one of the problems is that we don't know what the Trans-Pacific Partnership really is. People have seen pieces of it here and there, but we don't know because it has been negotiated in secret. And my constituents say, Well, KEITH, you send me—Congressman, you send me a copy of that Trans-Pacific Partnership. I want to know what it says.

And I say, Mr. Constituent, I can't send it to you because I don't have it. They haven't let me see it, not in its entirety. They send you pieces of it. You can look at this chapter or that chapter, but you can't look at the whole thing.

So they are going to basically, after they get their Trade Promotion Authority, they are going to give us a few weeks to basically look it over, and then we can only vote it up or down.

Ms. KAPTUR. I say to the gentleman, these agreements are so power-

ful they actually should be treated as treaties because they involve so much more than just goods. When you get into the legal right to sue and you look at what has happened to our country under these trade agreements—I don't know about Minnesota, but in our part of the country, we have something called the emerald ash borer that has eaten through all of our ash trees. It is a multibillion dollar problem. Cities like Toledo and Cleveland are losing 10 percent of their tree cover—10 percent—and those all have to be replanted. And that critter got in here in packing material. But who gets taken to court from the other country for sending in dirty soil here? There is no legal recourse.

If you look at the U.S. Department of Agriculture budget, in the invasive species account, you will find it skyrocketing as American taxpayers are being charged to try to clean up some of this mess that is happening across our country.

It isn't just the emerald ash borer. It is critters like the Asian beetle, which came in on Chinese packing crate material and is eating hardwoods all across our country. The damage is enormous, and there is no court. There is no place where we can go to hold the importer and the exporter responsible within the laws of our country.

What kind of a crazy system is this where we tie the hands of the American people?

Under NAFTA, we were told that we would have 200,000 more jobs in our country. But when NAFTA was passed, we fell into trade deficit with Mexico; and actually, we lost nearly 700,000 jobs just to Mexico because of NAFTA. So these trade agreements, they say they are one thing, but they actually come back and turn negative numbers, negative numbers.

I look at this Korean account. We were supposed to have 50,000 cars here, and all we have gotten is a handful—7,000. The Koreans have managed to sell over a half a million here.

If you go to those countries and you look at how they keep our vehicles out and how they promote their exports of parts here—the automotive repair dealers were in here a few weeks ago. I ran into them in the hallway. Why were they here? Because when they try to repair a car and the part comes in from a foreign country—let's say you are putting the hood on. The car was in an accident and you have to replace the hood. The fit isn't as good. The metal is more thin. It isn't as good a quality metal, and they can't make it fit the repair. So then the customer in our country gets mad.

These replacement parts are coming in from all over the world. It is an inferior product. It makes our repair dealers look like they are not doing a good job. It is not their fault, for heaven's sake. They are caught in this system that doesn't work for them, and it doesn't work for us. We have got to figure out a better way.

I think Congressman TONKO wanted to add a remark. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1730

Mr. TONKO. As we continue to banter on this importance of trade—of free trade versus fair trade—I can't help but be reminded of the pioneer spirit that has taken this Nation to moments of greatness, where that greatness was written by the American worker, oftentimes by the immigrant who came to this country to pursue the American Dream.

What we need to do here is have history instruct us. Let us understand what the greatness of this Nation is about. Our best days lie ahead of us if we do that, if we are willing to take lessons from American history, where our sons and daughters who, as our ancestors—many of them immigrants—came to these shores. It was their creative genius. It was their integrity. It was their ingenuity. It was their work ethic. It was their passion as they tethered that American Dream that grew these opportunities of manufacturing in our mill towns. They were undeniably the impetus.

Today, we need to be instructed by that pioneer spirit. We need to understand that, if given a fair shot, we can continue to grow upon that greatness, but if we suffocate that American Dream, if we suffocate the American worker, if we deny just remuneration for their sweat equity as they pour themselves into that job, if they are denied that job because of these trade deals, these negotiated outcomes that are denying again the worker across the world, then we all lose. It is important for us to understand that we need to invest in the manufacturing base. This is a walking away from history.

This is allowing greed to take over the equation of job creation. This is about providing for greed for a very few. Look at the relationship between the worker and the owner, the manager of these situations. We have reduced the worker. We see what the average income is looking like. We see what the household income is looking like. We have destroyed this. We have put people into lower-paying jobs as they have lost those manufacturing sector jobs. We have not allowed for the job growth.

We look at the chart that Representative KAPTUR has displayed for us here this evening. It is overwhelmingly convincing. When you look at the activity in one direction versus the activity in the opposite direction, it is absolutely, blatantly, obvious that we need to do better, and we don't do that. We don't begin by relinquishing the role of Congress in this process. A Fast Track, as it has been talked about here this evening, denies the opportunity for fair debate. It denies the opportunity for amendments. It requires a simple up-or-down vote. We don't need to put public policy in for worker protection, environmental standards, child labor

issues, consumer protection, public safety. All of these items are tossed into these agreements where there isn't the appropriate discussion and where the worker is held down—25 cents for the minimum wage in Vietnam, 75 cents for the average hourly wage, and then tossing people out of the American Dream here that they wanted to tether.

That pioneer spirit needs to be fed. That pioneer spirit needs to be nurtured. That pioneer spirit needs to be respected. That pioneer spirit needs to be revered. When we do that with sound trade opportunities, we will prosper because we have the intellectual capacity as a nation—we have the work ethic as a nation; we have the creative genius as a nation—to prosper. Give us the fair opportunities to grow our economy and allow for trade policy to initiate a new era of greatness for this country. That is when we are going to respond in justice and in fairness—in social and economic justice—that will allow us again to write these new annals of history that will show yet another era of greatness for the American worker.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, thank you for your passion, for the voice that you give to millions and millions of people across this country on the floor of Congress. We know we have our finger on the heart of where the American people are. It is just this city that is out of sync with where the public is, and we have to get them aligned once and for all.

You would think that a place that has been amassing mammoth trade deficits because of trade policies over the last 25 years would not be brain dead, but, apparently, some people are brain dead over on the executive side, and they have allowed America's communities to sink further and further into debt—into trade debt—and job loss. They are completely connected.

If you go to these other countries—and I had this chart up here about Korea, but Japan is the same. If you look at the number of vehicles coming here versus our vehicles going there, we are dealing with closed markets. It is not like these other places like our stuff. They figure out thousands of ways to block our products from going in. Oh, gosh. Twenty or 30 years ago, I went to Japan to figure out: Why weren't they buying U.S. cars and U.S. auto parts? I brought free spark plugs, and I said to the head of Toyota and to the head of Honda and to all of these companies, Please, we will give you free spark plugs. These were the best plugs we made in our country. Just try them out. In those days, the Japanese would only accept about 2 percent of automobiles in their market from any place else in the world, okay? When our market was open, over half the vehicles on our streets were from every place else in the world—made there rather than here, okay? Today, 30 years later, it is the same in Japan. They may be 3 percent of their market. They didn't

even take Yugos, for heaven's sake, when those things were on the market.

You are facing closed markets abroad. You are facing mammoth trade imbalances. The most important things those brilliant people over at the National Security Council economic division should do is pay attention to the United States of America for a change and ask themselves: Why isn't this formula working?

Do you know what? Your decisions are hurting the American people, who are funding your operation over there on the executive side. Somebody had better pay attention to these mammoth, mammoth hemorrhages because I will tell you what—this recent election I don't view as an ideological one. The American people are trying to find a way to start getting a little traction in their economic way of life. They are having trouble, and this city isn't listening. The structures that are there to help the American people are completely out of kilter, and they have been out of kilter for a long time. It is not fair to the American people. It is simply not fair.

We have to raise our voices here. I know there are living rooms out there that are listening to us tonight, and they are cheering what we are saying because they have lived it. They have lived the job loss. They have scratched and tried to get two and three jobs to try to hold their families and their households together. We have seen families split up because of the lack of income, and it isn't their fault. They are trying. They are trying to get a foothold.

I remember one President. I didn't like what he said, but he said, Walk with your feet. If you have got a problem, move somewhere else.

Do you know what? Where we live, our communities, our homes, our families, our neighbors—the communities we have built together—really mean something. It is us. We have invested our lives there—our parents, our grandparents. It isn't so easily cast away. I hope that is not an old-fashioned American idea, but people have labored for years to build our libraries, to build our museums, to build our zoos, our marinas, all of our parks. You just don't so easily walk away. Our homes mean something to us. It isn't fair to the people who have contributed so much to the betterment of this country to have it so rough, and it isn't their fault.

For all of the people I meet who are homeless, for all of the people who have fallen on tough times, they want to work. These are workers. Why should workers have to go on food stamps, for heaven's sake, in the United States of America? What an embarrassment that is for this country. Then we have certain people here in the Congress who say, Oh, just cut them off. What are they supposed to do? Where are they supposed to go when their jobs have been royally outsourced elsewhere? This is not a few jobs but millions and millions.

I have had the gift in my lifetime of being able to travel, to go follow the job. Go see what happened when Trico moved out of Buffalo. Go see what happened when Mr. Coffee moved out of Cleveland. When you start following these places, then, all of a sudden, it becomes clear: oh, somebody is making a whole lot of money off of the outsourcing of jobs. Do you know what? It wasn't the people in my community. It wasn't the workers. It wasn't even the small business people. It is the capitalists who take the money—those people who are rich enough to own these companies—and who then figure out they can outsource it so they can make more money, not work with the people in these communities who have given their lives, their sweat for these places. It is so disrespectful. It is un-American. It is un-American what they are doing.

Mr. TONKO. The gentlewoman talks about the ownership—the pride of developing community and neighborhood, the investment that the worker made in growing a family, developing a household, building a neighborhood in a strong and powerful and meaningful way. Those are the mill town memories. Those memories guide my heart and soul.

I am from a mill town. I still live in that mill town and represent that mill town here in the House of Representatives, and it was the clamor of that assembly line that resonated to people of all ages in that mill town. It was the activity. It was the hustle and bustle of manufacturing that resonated, that became the pulse of manufacturing, and that became the heart of a mill town. You knew which day the mill was shut—there was silence—but now the silence is deafening, and we need to bring back that resurgence, that opportunity which meant the American Dream, meant an opportunity to earn a paycheck—the dignity to earn that paycheck—and to be able to raise a family and develop and maintain a household. That is what it is all about. It is about economic and social justice.

So we have work to do, and I believe that Washington needs to listen to small-town mill town across this country, to the middle-income community that reminds us it is about the dignity of work; that they want to invest their skill set, that they want to invest their professionalism, they want to invest their work ethic in building a product, allowing us to taste that greatness of manufacturing.

We look at the data that are assembled that should guide us here, and we see CEO salaries and productivity rising steeply upward. Meanwhile, flattened, if not dipping south, is the average worker's salary. Something is fundamentally unjust about that outcome. Something is fundamentally unsustainable about that outcome. If we are going to enjoy prosperity, every strata of the income ladder is affected if we are not dealing with worker fairness. Then and only then, if we address

worker fairness, can we rightfully hope to have a better tomorrow. Isn't that what we are about—providing hope, instilling hope into the hearts and minds and souls of individuals and families, of workers—of the mill towns of the American economy?

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, your service gives us hope, and I know it gives the people of your district hope. Thank you for joining us this evening.

I am going to yield to Congressman KEITH ELLISON of Minnesota, who has spent the evening here with us.

Thank you so much for working overtime on behalf of your constituents and all of America.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlewoman.

Again, I just want to point out that President Obama correctly said that income inequality is the defining issue of our time. I think he was right when he said that.

When you look at why do we have the flat and declining wages that the Congressman from New York, PAUL TONKO, just mentioned and that you have mentioned—why? What are the components of this?—I can tell you that it is clear that we have not invested in public infrastructure, which would put people to work and improve productivity. It is clear that we have cut the taxes of the wealthiest and the most privileged people in our society, and, literally, we have added them onto people in the middle, and we have failed to educate people properly. Yet one of the components that we can never forget is this trade policy. You cannot intelligently claim that you want to do something about income inequality and pass these trade deals which ship jobs overseas and put downward pressure on wages here.

This is a key part of how we get the American middle and working classes back to getting raises again.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman so much for that excellent point.

I take it, by the signal, our time has expired. We thank all of those for listening who are present.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN BILL FRENZEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise with several of my colleagues to honor the work and memory of Congressman Bill Frenzel, who passed away on Monday. Congressman Frenzel represented Minnesota's Third Congressional District for 20 years, first elected in 1970 and retiring in 1990.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, many of us tonight had already planned to speak today to express our love and appreciation to Bill from this floor, even before we learned of his death.

Now, it just feels too late, in a way, but one of the benefits of extolling the virtues of people greater than ourselves is that we become better still, so we are keeping with that plan tonight.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that as I stand here in this Chamber, where Bill did some of his best work, my heart is more full of emotions than my head is full of ideas, and there are many facts that I could recite about the service of Bill Frenzel; instead, I am going to try to capture the man that I knew, the man that we all knew, and the man that we all truly loved and respected.

When I received the news that Bill passed away on Monday, there was a scrap of paper hanging on my wall in my Washington office and also a scrap of paper hanging on my Minnesota wall that became my prized possessions. They are two vintage Frenzel doodles.

There are hundreds of them out there—whimsical, fantastically detailed little drawings that Bill Frenzel did while he was on the phone, while he was in committee meetings, listening to testimony, or during debates. Such was the hyperactivity of this brilliant mind, that when he was required to sit still, his drawing hand had to be moving.

I say that to convey the idea that Bill Frenzel was just more alive than most people that you meet. He was always thinking. He was always creating. He was always pushing positive ideas, and in the interactions that I had with him, it was like he was always leaning forward at you at an angle, like a person walking boldly into a stiff wind.

Bill Frenzel was a serious legislator, often pouring over line by line of the Federal budget. In fact, that practice continued after he left Congress. Every year, he would make a phone call to my office, requesting his copy of the annual Federal budget.

It is amazing to me that anyone would even want this massive document sitting on their bookshelf, but what is truly amazing is that Bill would actually go through this budget line by line for decades after he left this institution.

Bill believed in and dedicated his life to doing the greatest good for the greatest number of people, and for Bill, the way that he did the greatest good for the greatest number of people was by promoting and advancing international trade.

I suppose it began by looking at the great good being done around the world